THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

–

WRIT PETITION NO : 14768 of 1994

–

DATED: 17.11.2005

Between:

K. Amarender Reddy

… PETITIONER

–

AND

Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board,

Rep., by its Member Secretary, Vidyut Soudha,
Kairatabad, Hyderabad & others.

… RESPONDENTS

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 14768 of 1994

ORDER:-

The petitioner approached this Court through this writ petition seeking a direction to the respondents to prepare the seniority list of the Assistant Engineers (Civil) by reckoning the seniority of the petitioner as per the ranking in Annexure to B.P.Ms.No.210, dated 04.03.1989, in the category of Assistant

Engineer (Civil) strictly in accordance with the Regulation 26(a) of APSEB Service Regulations after declaring Para 3 of the B.P.Ms.No.210, dated 04.03.1989, and the seniority fixed in B.P. (P&G.Per) Ms.No.59, dated 07.05.1994 as being ab-initio void and contrary to law and unconstitutional.

The petitioner contends that his services were regularized as Assistant Engineer (Civil) and he is qualified to be considered for promotion to the post of Assistant Divisional Engineer (Civil). The petitioner's grievance is that though he was at Sl.No.16 in the seniority list of the Assistant Engineers, as per the ranking in Annexure to B.P.ms.No.59, dated 07.05.1994, it was changed to Sl.No.36, which is contrary to Regulation No.26(a) of the APSEB Regulations, thereby he was deprived of the opportunity of promotion. Therefore, it is essential to direct the respondents to prepare the seniority list of the Assistant Engineers (Civil) by reckoning the seniority as per ranking in Annexure to B.P.Ms.No.210, dated 04.03.1989.

The respondents did not file any counter regarding the procedure that was followed and the circumstances under which the ranking of the petitioner was changed.

Unless the entire information is made available, it is not possible for this Court to hold whether the ranking fixed by the respondents in terms of B.P.Ms.No.59, dated 07.05.1994, is on correct lines or not. It is also not known as to what were the subsequent developments took place after filing this writ petition.

In the light of the above circumstances, it would be appropriate if the petitioner is directed to make a representation to the appropriate authorities ventilating his grievance and in the event of any order by the concerned authorities affecting his interest, the petitioner is at liberty to seek appropriate relief before the appropriate forum.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to cost.

17.11.2005

ES